

CITY OF SOMERVILLE, MASSACHUSETTS MAYOR'S OFFICE OF STRATEGIC PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT JOSEPH A. CURTATONE MAYOR

MICHAEL F. GLAVIN EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

PLANNING DIVISION

ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS MEMBERS

ORSOLA SUSAN FONTANO, CHAIRMAN RICHARD ROSSETTI, CLERK DANIELLE EVANS ELAINE SEVERINO JOSH SAFDIE ANNE BROCKELMAN, (ALT.) POOJA PHALTANKAR, (ALT.) Case #: ZBA 2017-13 Site: 91-93 Rogers Avenue

Date of Decision: March 15, 2017

Decision: <u>Petition Approved with Conditions</u> **Date Filed with City Clerk:** March 17, 2017

ZBA DECISION

Applicant Name:Arthur D. O'Callaghan & Maria O'CallaghanApplicant Address:302 Woburn Street, Reading, MA 01867Property Owner Name:Arthur D. O'Callaghan & Maria O'CallaghanProperty Owner Address:302 Woburn Street, Reading, MA 01867

Agent Name: N/A

<u>Legal Notice:</u> Applicants and Owners, Arthur and Maria O'Callaghan, seek a Special

Permit under SZO §4.4.1 to increase the FAR of a nonconforming

structure by finishing the basement. RA Zone. Ward 6.*

*The legal advertisement erroneously indicated that this property was located in Ward 6. It is in fact located in Ward 5.

Zoning District/Ward: RA zone/Ward 6

Zoning Approval Sought: §4.4.1

Date of Application:
Date(s) of Public Hearing:
Date of Decision:

March 15, 2017
March 15, 2017

Vote: 5-0

Appeal #ZBA 2017-13 was opened before the Zoning Board of Appeals at Somerville City Hall on March 15, 2017. Notice of the Public Hearing was given to persons affected and was published and posted, all as required by M.G.L. c. 40A, sec. 11 and the Somerville Zoning Ordinance. After one hearing of deliberation, the Zoning Board of Appeals took a vote.



Date: March 17, 2017 Case #:ZBA 2017-13 Site: 91-93 Rogers Avenue

DESCRIPTION:

The proposal is to finish a portion of the basement to create a bathroom and an entertainment/play area for the first floor unit.

FINDINGS FOR SPECIAL PERMIT (SZO §4.4.1):

In order to grant a special permit, the SPGA must make certain findings and determinations as outlined in §5.1.4 of the SZO. This section of the report goes through §5.1.4 in detail.

1. <u>Information Supplied:</u>

The Board finds that the information provided by the Applicant conforms to the requirements of §5.1.2 of the SZO and allows for a comprehensive analysis of the project with respect to the required Special Permits.

2. <u>Compliance with Standards:</u> The Applicant must comply "with such criteria or standards as may be set forth in this Ordinance which refer to the granting of the requested special permit."

The proposal will impact the nonconforming dimension of the floor area ratio (FAR). The current FAR is 0.88, the proposal will increase the FAR to 1.07, and the requirement in the district is 0.75. This alteration to a nonconforming structure requires the Applicant to obtain special permits under §4.4.1 of the Somerville Zoning Ordinance (SZO).

Section 4.4.1 states that "[l]awfully existing one-and two-family dwellings which are only used as residences, which are nonconforming with respect to dimensional requirements, may be enlarged, extended, renovated or altered by special permit granted by the SPGA in accordance with the procedures of Article 5."

In considering a special permit under §4.4 of the SZO, the Board finds that the alterations proposed would not be substantially more detrimental to the neighborhood than the existing structure.

3. <u>Consistency with Purposes:</u> The Applicant has to ensure that the project "is consistent with (1) the general purposes of this Ordinance as set forth in Article 1, and (2) the purposes, provisions, and specific objectives applicable to the requested special permit which may be set forth elsewhere in this Ordinance, such as, but not limited to, those purposes at the beginning of the various Articles."

The proposal is consistent with the general purposes of the Ordinance as set forth under §1.2, which includes, but is not limited to promote the health, safety, and welfare of the inhabitants of the City of Somerville; to secure safety from fire, panic and other dangers; to provide adequate light and air; to prevent the overcrowding of land; to avoid undue concentration of population; and to encourage the most appropriate use of land throughout the City.

The proposal is consistent with the purpose of the RA district, which is, "to establish and preserve quiet neighborhoods of one- and two-family homes, free from other uses except those which are both compatible with and convenient to the residents of such districts."

4. <u>Site and Area Compatibility:</u> The Applicant has to ensure that the project "(i)s designed in a manner that is compatible with the characteristics of the built and unbuilt surrounding area, including land uses."

Surrounding Neighborhood: The surrounding neighborhood is comprised of mostly single and two-family dwellings with a few three-family dwellings in the neighborhood. The proposal will not result in additional dwelling units; therefore the structure will remain a two-family dwelling and will be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood.



Page 3

Date: March 17, 2017

Case #:ZBA 2017-13

Site: 91-93 Rogers Avenue

Impacts of Proposal (Design and Compatibility): the proposal will not have an impact on the design of the structure or the compatibility of the structure with the surrounding neighborhood.

6. <u>Housing Impact:</u> Will not create adverse impacts on the stock of existing affordable housing.

There will no adverse impact on the stock of existing affordable housing.

7. <u>SomerVision Plan:</u> Complies with the applicable goals, policies and actions of the SomerVision plan, including the following, as appropriate: Preserve and enhance the character of Somerville's neighborhoods, transform key opportunity areas, preserve and expand an integrated, balanced mix of safe, affordable and environmentally sound rental and homeownership units for households of all sizes and types from diverse social and economic groups; and, make Somerville a regional employment center with a mix of diverse and high-quality jobs. The areas in the SomerVision map that are designated as enhance and transform should most significantly contribute towards the SomerVision goals that are outlined in the table below. The areas marked as conserve are not expected to greatly increase the figures in the table since these areas are not intended for large scale change.

The proposal will preserve the character of the neighborhood and will add living space to an existing housing unit.



Date: March 17, 2017 Case #:ZBA 2017-13 Site: 91-93 Rogers Avenue

DECISION:

Present and sitting were Members Orsola Susan Fontano, Richard Rossetti, Danielle Evans, Elaine Severino and Josh Safdie with Pooja Phaltankar absent. Upon making the above findings, Richard Rossetti made a motion to approve the request for a Special Permit. Elaine Severino seconded the motion. Wherefore the Zoning Board of Appeals voted **5-0** to **APPROVE** the request. In addition the following conditions were attached:

| | Condition | | Timeframe for Compliance | Verified (initial) | Notes |
|-----|---|--|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------|
| | Approval is to finish the basement. This approval is based upon the following application materials and the plans submitted by the Applicant: | | BP/CO | ISD/Plng. | |
| 1 | Date (Stamp Date) | Submission | | | |
| | January 26, 2016 | Initial application submitted to the City Clerk's Office | | | |
| | (March 2, 2017) | Plans submitted to OSPCD | | | |
| | Any changes to the approved site plan or elevations/use that are not <i>de minimis</i> must receive SPGA approval. Whether or not a change is <i>de minimis</i> in nature must be determined by the Planning Office. | | | | |
| Cor | nstruction Impacts | | | | • |
| 2 | The Applicant shall, at his expense, replace any existing equipment (including, but not limited to street sign poles, signs, traffic signal poles, traffic signal equipment, wheel chair ramps, granite curbing, etc) and the entire sidewalk immediately abutting the subject property if damaged as a result of construction activity. All new sidewalks and driveways must be constructed to DPW standard. | | СО | DPW | |
| 3 | All construction materials a onsite. If occupancy of the occupancy must be in confe the Manual on Uniform Traprior approval of the Traffic be obtained. | During Construction | T&P | | |
| 4 | The applicant shall post the name and phone number of the general contractor at the site entrance where it is visible to people passing by. | | During Construction | ISD/Plng. | |
| Pul | olic Safety | | | | |
| 5 | The Applicant or Owner shall meet the Fire Prevention Bureau's requirements. | | СО | FP | |
| 6 | All smoke detectors shall be hard-wired. | | СО | Fire Prevention / ISD | |



Page 5

Date: March 17, 2017

Case #:ZBA 2017-13

Site: 91-93 Rogers Avenue

| | The Applicant shall contact Planning Staff at least five | Final sign | Plng. | |
|---|---|------------|-------|--|
| | working days in advance of a request for a final inspection | off | | |
| 7 | by Inspectional Services to ensure the proposal was | | | |
| | constructed in accordance with the plans and information | | | |
| | submitted and the conditions attached to this approval. | | | |



Page 6

Case #:ZBA 2017-13 Site: 91-93 Rogers Avenue

in the Office of the City Clark

Date: March 17, 2017

| Attest, by the Zoning E | Board of Appeals: | Orsola Susan | Fontano, Chairman |
|-------------------------|-------------------|--------------|-------------------|
| rucsi, by the Zonnig L | Journ of Appears. | Orsola Busan | i omano, chan man |

Richard Rossetti, *Clerk*Danielle Evans
Elaine Severino
Josh Safdie

Attest, by the Administrative Assistant:

Dawn M. Pereira

Copies of this decision are filed in the Somerville City Clerk's office. Copies of all plans referred to in this decision and a detailed record of the SPGA proceedings are filed in the Somerville Planning Dept.

This is a true and correct convert the decision filed on

CLERK'S CERTIFICATE

Any appeal of this decision must be filed within twenty days after the date this notice is filed in the Office of the City Clerk, and must be filed in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40A, sec. 17 and SZO sec. 3.2.10.

In accordance with M.G.L. c. 40 A, sec. 11, no variance shall take effect until a copy of the decision bearing the certification of the City Clerk that twenty days have elapsed after the decision has been filed in the Office of the City Clerk and no appeal has been filed, or that if such appeal has been filed, that it has been dismissed or denied, is recorded in the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds and indexed in the grantor index under the name of the owner of record or is recorded and noted on the owner's certificate of title.

Also in accordance with M.G.L. c. 40 A, sec. 11, a special permit shall not take effect until a copy of the decision bearing the certification of the City Clerk that twenty days have elapsed after the decision has been filed in the Office of the City Clerk and either that no appeal has been filed or the appeal has been filed within such time, is recorded in the Middlesex County Registry of Deeds and indexed in the grantor index under the name of the owner of record or is recorded and noted on the owner's certificate of title. The person exercising rights under a duly appealed Special Permit does so at risk that a court will reverse the permit and that any construction performed under the permit may be ordered undone.

The owner or applicant shall pay the fee for recording or registering. Furthermore, a permit from the Division of Inspectional Services shall be required in order to proceed with any project favorably decided upon by this decision, and upon request, the Applicant shall present evidence to the Building Official that this decision is properly recorded.

| This is a true and correct copy of the decision fried on | in the Office of the City Clerk, |
|---|----------------------------------|
| and twenty days have elapsed, and | |
| FOR VARIANCE(S) WITHIN | |
| there have been no appeals filed in the Office of the City Clerk, | or |
| any appeals that were filed have been finally dismissed or denied | d. |
| FOR SPECIAL PERMIT(S) WITHIN | |
| there have been no appeals filed in the Office of the City Clerk, | or |
| there has been an appeal filed. | |
| Signed | tv Clark Data |

